

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/594,782	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BELBACHIR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> ANDRIAE M. HOLT	<b>Art Unit</b> 1616

<b>All Participants:</b>	<b>Status of Application:</b> <u>71</u>
(1) <u>ANDRIAE M. HOLT.</u>	(3) _____.
(2) <u>Richard Danyko, Attorney.</u>	(4) _____.
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>15 June 2011</u>	<b>Time:</b> <u>12:00 p.m.</u>

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)  
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**  
Rejection(s) discussed:  
  
  
Claims discussed:  
35  
  
Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**  
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*The examiner contacted Mr. Danyko to try to advance prosecution of the claims. The examiner indicated that claim 35, which was rewritten in independent form contained allowable subject matter, with the exception of 112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph issues. The examiner also indicated that the remainder of the claims were still obvious of the prior art. Mr. Danyko requested that an Office Action be issued in writing because his client is in another country and it would be easier to explain the Office Action. The examiner will send a written response.*

**Part III.**  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)